

Date: Thu, 5 May 94 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #193
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 5 May 94 Volume 94 : Issue 193

Today's Topics:

 New FCC amateur radio licenses (2 msgs)
 subscribe

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 3 May 1994 14:50:42 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!news.cac.psu.edu!news.pop.psu.edu!
ra!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: New FCC amateur radio licenses
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I've noticed that the recent amateur radio licenses come in two parts:
the traditional wallet document, and one that can be framed to be hung in
the shack. I was last issued a license in 1990 that was printed with an
impact printer, and it's a little hard to read. It appears that the new
licenses are laser printed.

Question: Can I ask the FCC for the new license? I'd like to get the
part you can frame. (Somehow I feel the answer is going to be 'no.')

-Dave

--

David Drumheller, KA3QBQ phone: (202) 767-3524
Acoustics Division, Code 7140 fax: (202) 404-7732
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, DC 20375-5350 e-mail: drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil

Date: 4 May 94 23:02:56 GMT
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!tedtrost@yale.arpa
Subject: New FCC amateur radio licenses
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>I was last issued a license in 1990 that was printed with an
>impact printer, and it's a little hard to read. It appears that the new
>licenses are laser printed.

> Question: Can I ask the FCC for the new license? I'd like to get the
>part you can frame. (Somehow I feel the answer is going to be 'no.')

Dave-- why not just try it? If it doesn't work, "lose" your existing one
and get a new one.

Ted Trost
Internet: tedtrost@delphi.com Delphi: TEDTROST CompuServe: 71175,1043
Amateur radio station N1RDQ "I like beer. On occasion I will even
drink a beer to celebrate a major event such as the fall of communism
or the fact that our refrigerator is still working." --Dave Barry

Date: 5 May 94 02:43:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: subscribe
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

subscribe

Date: 4 May 94 15:48:27 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!msuinfo!cravitma@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <phb.767540105@melpar>, <ddtodd.63.0016E34F@ucdavis.edu>,
<phb.768060210@melpar>
Subject : Re: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon

On Wed, 4 May 1994 14:03:30 GMT, strange alien beings caused Paul H. Bock
(phb@syseng1.melpar.esys.com) to write:

> BTW, does anyone know if there ARE legal requirements on
> dealers? If so, what kind?

As far as I can ascertain, at this point there are no dealer requirements of any kind. It is the responsibility of the purchaser to ensure compliance with the laws, whatever they may be.

/Matthew

--

Matthew Cravit, N9VWG | All opinions expressed here are
Michigan State University | my own. I don't speak for MSU
E-Mail: cravitma@cps.msu.edu | and they don't speak for me.
PGP public key available from <http://web.cps.msu.edu/~cravitma>

Date: 4 May 94 14:03:30 GMT
From: newsgate.melpar.esys.com!melpar!phb@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Cotp3M.CvL@world.std.com>, <phb.767540105@melpar>,
<ddtodd.63.0016E34F@ucdavis.edu>
Subject : Re: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon

ddtodd@ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

>>the radio salesman. Maybe there should also be a penalty for the sales-
>>man/dealer who doesn't *actively* inform his customers of the rules...

>I think it is wrong (if even possible) to punish based on intentions. If there

Well, let's look at it a different way. A *licensed* ham is REQUIRED to know the rules and regulations. If he violates them, it is de facto a *with malice aforethought* violation; he/she cannot say, "Well, gee, FCC, I didn't know about THAT rule!" Sort of analogous to speeding in a car ("Gee, officer, I didn't know what the speed limit was...").

Similarly, a dealer in two-way radio equipment should know what he is selling, and what licensing requirements there are. He has a *moral* responsibility to society to help prevent bedlam on the airwaves by not selling equipment to folks without informing them of the licensing requirements; whether or not he is *legally* required to do so may be another matter. Of course, he can't be prosecuted if he isn't legally bound. He also isn't responsible if he informs the buyer of the licensing requirements and they ignore it; then the burden of guilt is on them. They were informed, they chose to ignore the requirements.

However, the innocent person who has never had any kind of radio license, commercial or amateur, and knows nothing about radio

licensing requirements (about 95+% of the population, probably), is at least a partial victim if (a) he buys transmitting equipment and is not informed by the dealer that he needs a license, AND (b) there is no documentation with the radio which tells him he needs a license. He's still guilty of breaking the law, but in a sense he's been victimized. Maybe it would never happen; maybe all the documentation supplied does say "You need a license." But, in my mind, a *responsible* dealer would WARN the buyer at the time of sale, and perhaps have available the blank application forms and even offer to assist the buyer in filling them out.

I'm not out to get dealers, or see them prosecuted; I'd just like to see the public be properly informed of the rules before they buy. Then if they transgress, it's their neck.

BTW, does anyone know if there ARE legal requirements on dealers? If so, what kind?

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #193
